

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 were pending in the application prior to this amendment. Claims 1, 12, 26 and 34 have been amended herein. Claims 8, 11, 18-25 and 29-33 have been canceled. Claims 2-7, 9, 10, 13-17, 27 and 28 remain in the application unchanged. Accordingly, after entry of this amendment, claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-17, 26-28 and 34 will remain pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration are requested.

**I. Objection to the Drawings**

In paragraph 3 of the Office action, the Examiner objects to the drawings, indicating that the edges of the tear out area should be shown. In response to the Examiner's objection, applicants submit herewith proposed changes to drawing Figs. 2 and 3. Specifically, applicants propose to modify Figs. 2 and 3 as shown in red on the attached "Annotated Sheet". It is believed that, with the indicated corrections to Figs. 2 and 3, the Examiner's objection is addressed.

Applicants have also attached a "Replacement Sheet" incorporating the proposed changes indicated in red on the Annotated Sheet. The Examiner's approval of the proposed drawing corrections is requested.

**II. Specification**

In paragraph 4 of the Office action, the Examiner notes that the blank for the missing patent application serial no. should be filled in on page 13. In response, applicants have amended page 13 of the specification herein in an appropriate manner.

**III. Rejection of Claims 8 and 34 Under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 8 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Reexamination and reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection are requested.

Claim 8 has been canceled herein.

With respect to claim 34, the Examiner questions the use of the term

S.N. 10/053,732  
Art Unit 3727  
Atty Dkt PP 5.83

“coplanar”. Applicants have amended claim 34 herein to replace each occurrence of the phrase “coplanar with” to now read “parallel to” as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 34 is believed to be addressed.